UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/037,236	11/09/2001	James F. Zucherman	5910-162	6669
	7590 09/24/200 NNETT/MEDTRONIC	EXAMINER		
1400 CRESCEI		COMSTOCK, DAVID C		
SUITE 300 CARY, NC 275	518		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3733	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/24/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/037,236	ZUCHERMAN ET A	L.
Examiner	Art Unit	

	DAVID CONSTOCK	3733	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>22 August 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AI	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, wwith 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the r (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE f).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount chortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I	out prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co	•	ΓE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	•		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	ter form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying the	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a o	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	serresponding framiser of finally reju	solod ciairrio.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOI -324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mphane, anonamone (
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	,		g
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>60-67,97,106,108-110,112,113 and 119</u>	<u>9-137</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.		n condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).13. ☐ Other:	P10/58/08) Paper No(s)		
/Eduardo C. Robert/	/David Comstock/		
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3733	Examiner, Art Unit 3733		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The endcap is disposed generally transverse to the longitudinal axis of the shaft (i.e., a line which would extend vertically up the center of Fig. 3) at least because it is positioned to extend (i.e. thickness) in a direction that is transverse to the longitudinal axis of the shaft. It is certainly not unreasonable to construe the endcap as being disposed generally transverse to the longitudinal axis of the shaft, since the meaning of the term "disposed" is broad and admits of various interpretations and more importantly, the thickness of the endcap extends in a transverse or radial, outward direction. As such, it occupies a position that would be on an annular frame of reference with respect to the shaft. Likewise, Examiner's interpretation of the endcap facing the spacer is not unreasonably broad, but rather is guite literal. It is Applicant's responsibility to draft the claims to overcome any ambiguity that may be present. It is also noted that assemblies are formed by assembling the individual components thereof. Therefore, when referring to an assembly (as is shown by Voydeville), it is a distinction without a difference to say "integrally assembled" instead of "integrally formed". Moreover, without the pin being secured in place by the endcap, the spacer could not be longitudinally constrained, since the parts would not be assembled and there would be no structure in place to retain the spacer. Therefore, the endcap. together with other elements, indeed constrains displacement of the spacer. Applicant's arguments pertaining to the parallel but differing claim terminology between claims 60+ and 128+ is without merit, as Applicant clearly understood the relationship of the terms and addressed the rejection accordingly. Finally, the terminology set forth in the rejection primarily addresses the currently pending claims but may address limitations that were previously pending and/or that potentially could be added again by amendment. As at least what is claimed has been referenced and discussed, it should not be a problem to describe the nature of the reference. Accordingly, the Examiner maintains the finality of the outstanding rejection.

Note regarding item 7 above: The after-final request for reconsideration will be entered (the form indicates "proposed amendment(s)").